

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 05690 01 OF 02 152106Z

67

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 INRE-00 USIE-00 AEC-05

CIAE-00 EUR-08 H-01 INR-05 IO-04 L-01 NSAE-00 OIC-01

OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15

TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-05 DRC-01 /068 W  
----- 130995

O P 152000Z OCT 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 8184

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 5690

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJ: MBFR: SPC DISCUSSION OCTOBER 14 ON AIR MANPOWER

REF: A) MBFR VIENNA 291; B) MBFR VIENNA 318; C) STATE 223226

SUMMARY FRG REP AT OCTOBER 14 WPC MEETING MADE BONN'S FIRST INSTRUCTED COMMENTS ON U.S. PROPOSALS ON ROLE OF AIR FORCE MANPOWER IN MBFR. FRG WANTS ALLIES TO STUDY POSSIBILITY OF NON-CIRCUMVENTION CLAUSE TO HANDLE PROBLEM OF CIRCUMVENTION OF MBFR AGREEMENT THROUGH INCREASES IN AIR FORCE MANPOWER. IF AFTER SUCH STUDY ALLIES DECIDED THAT THEY PREFERRED A NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT ON AIR MANPOWER, THIS COMMITMENT SHOULD BE SEPARATE FROM THE EXISTING COMMITMENT REGARDING GROUND FORCES. FRG REP EXPRESSED FRG DOUBTS ABOUT THE OTHER U.S. PROPOSALS, AND FRG WISH THAT MBFR WORKING GROUP STUDY ALL THE PROPOSALS. U.S. REP PRESENTED REASONS FOR DESIRABILITY OF NON-INCREASE APPROACH OVER NON-CIRCUMVENTION APPROACH. UK REP AGREED  
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 05690 01 OF 02 152106Z

WITH U.S. THAT NON-INCREASE DID NOT REQUIRE FURTHER WG STUDY, BUT SAID UK WISHED SACEUR COMMENT. UK IS LEANING TOWARD NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT ON AIR MANPOWER RATHER THAN HANDLING IT IN NON-CIRCUMVENTION CLASE. SPC AGREED TO CONTINUE WORK IN SPC AT

LEAST FOR PRESENT ON NON-INCREASE, WHILE AWAITING SACEUR COMMENT, AND TO SEND THE OTHER U.S. PROPOSALS TO WORKING GROUP FOR MILITARY-TECHNICAL STUDY.

1. NETHERLANDS REP (SIZOO) SAID HIS AUTHORITIES NOTE THAT THE AHG WILL AT SOME TIME NEED TO DISCUSS WITH WP THE QUESTION OF WHICH FORCES WILL REDUCE. IN THAT CONTEXT THE ALLIES SHOULD EXPRESS WILLINGNESS TO INCLUDE AIR MANPOWER IN THE NEGOTIATION. NETHERLANDS AUTHORITIES BELIEVE THIS MAY HELP ALLIED EFFORT TO GAIN EASTERN ACCEPTANCE OF THE COMMON CEILING. HOWEVER, THE NETHERLANDS AUTHORITIES SUPPOSE THAT ALLIED ACCEPTANCE OF INCLUSION OF NUCLEAR ELEMENTS WILL BE NECESSARY TO GAIN FINAL EASTERN ACCEPTANCE OF THE COMMON CEILING.

2. SIZOO SAID HIS AUTHORITIES HAD THE FOLLOWING COMMENT ON THE FIVE U.S. PROPOSALS. REGARDING THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT, THE NETHERLANDS IS WILLING TO ACCEPT THIS APPROACH, AND HAS NO INTENTION OF INCREASING ITS AIR FORCE MANPOWER. REGARDING THE EXCHANGE OF DATA, THE NETHERLANDS WONDERS IF THE U.S. INTENDS TO AMEND THE RECENT GUIDANCE TO VIENNA ON USE OF AIR FORCE DATA. HE NOTED THAT THE NETHERLANDS DID NOT WANT A DISCUSSION OF AIR FORCE DATA PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF AN EXCHANGE OF GROUND FORCE DATA. INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER IN MANPOWER COMMON CEILING SHOULD NOT DIVERT THE MAIN FOCUS OF THE NEGOTIATION FROM REDUCTION OF GROUND FORCES. INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER IN THE DATA BASE APPEARS SENSIBLE BUT THE HAGUE NEEDS FURTHER EXPLANATION. THE 15 PERCENT REDUCTION OF U.S. AND SOVIET AIR MANPOWER IN PHASE I REQUIRES FURTHER STUDY, PARTICULARLY ITS EFFECTS ON U.S. STRENGTH.

3. FRG REP (RANTZAU) MADE BONN'S FIRST INSTRUCTED COMMENTS ON THE U.S. PROPOSALS. HE SAID THE FRG CONSIDERS THE INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER A NEW ELEMENT WHICH THE ALLIES NEED TO EXAMINE VERY CAREFULLY.

4. RANTZAU SAID THE FRG BELIEVES IT WOULD BE PREMATURE TO DISCUSS INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER IN THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT  
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 05690 01 OF 02 152106Z

UNTIL THE ALLIES HAVE STUDIED WHETHER THE PROBLEM COULD BE HANDLED AS PART OF A NON-CIRCUMVENTION CLAUSE. IF THE ALLIES DECIDED THAT A NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT WAS THE BETTER COURSE, THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT ON AIR MANPOWER SHOULD BE CLEARLY SEPARATE FROM THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT ON GROUND FORCES CONTAINED IN THE GUIDANCE ON PHASE LINKAGE (C-M(74(30 REVISED)). THIS IS BECAUSE THE GUIDANCE ON PHASE LINKAGE ALSO INCLUDES THE ALL PARTICIPANTS COMMITMENT, WHEREBY THE ALLIES HAVE INDICATED TO THE OTHER SIDE THE WILLINGNESS OF ALL NON-U.S. WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS TO REDUCE IN PHASE II. THUS, INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER IN THE PRESENT NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT WOULD INDICATE TO THE OTHER SIDE A WILLINGNESS OF THE NON-U.S. ALLIES TO REDUCE AIR FORCE MANPOWER IN PHASE II.

RANTZAU NOTED, IN RESPONSE TO THE QUESTION IN THE WG PAPER, THAT THE FRG DID NOT ENVISAGE INCREASES IN AIR FORCE MANPOWER WHICH A NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT WOULD IMPEDE.

5. RANTZAU SAID THAT INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER IN A MANPOWER COMMON CEILING MIGHT IN THEORY BEING THE ALLIES CLOSER TO A SOLUTION OF THE CIRCUMVENTION PROBLEM. HOWEVER, THE FRG HAS STRONG DOUBTS THAT INCLUSION OF AIR FORCE MANPOWER IN THE COMMON CEILING AND IN THE DATA BASE COULD AVOID A SHIFTING OF EMPHASIS IN MBFR AWAY FROM GROUND FORCES. THE FRG MAINTAINS A SUBSTANTIAL

RESERVE AGAINST THE INCLUSION OF AIR FORCE MANPOWER IN ACTUAL REDUCTIONS. THE SUGGESTION THAT THE U.S. AND THE SOVIET UNION REDUCE AIR MANPOWER BY 15 PERCENT IN PHASE I WOULD GIVE THE

OTHER SIDE THE IMPRESSION OF MOVEMENT TOWARD THE EASTERN POSITION OF EQUAL PERCENTAGE CUTS AND AWAY FROM THE ALLIED POSITION OF ASYMMETRICAL CUTS. RANTZAU STRESSED THAT ALL MILITARY-TECHNICAL ASPECTS OF THE U.S. PROPOSAL REQUIRED FURTHER EXAMINATION.

6. ITALIAN REP (SFARA) ALSO SUPPORTED FURTHER EXAMINATION OF MILITARY-TECHNICAL ASPECTS OF THE U.S. PROPOSAL.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 05690 02 OF 02 152144Z

67

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-08 ISO-00 SSO-00 INRE-00 USIE-00 AEC-05

CIAE-00 H-01 INR-05 IO-04 L-01 NSAE-00 OIC-01 OMB-01

PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00

RSC-01 NSC-05 DRC-01 /068 W  
----- 000284

O P 152000Z OCT 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 8185

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 5690

7. U.S. REP (MOORE) STRESSED ADVANTAGES OF HANDLING AIR FORCE MANPOWER IN A NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT RATHER THAN A NON-CIRCUMVENTION CLAUSE, ALONG THE LINES OF REF A. HE POINTED OUT THAT INCLUSION

OF AIR MANPOWER IN A NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT WOULD ENABLE THE ALLIES TO PROBE WHETHER EASTERN INTEREST IN INCLUSION OF AIR FORCES COULD BE USED AT A LOW COST TO THE ALLIES TOWARD GAINING BASIC ALLIED NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES OF THE COMMON CEILING AND ASYMMETRICAL GROUND FORCE REDUCTIONS. IF THE ALLIES SOUGHT TO HANDLE THE PROBLEM IN A GENERAL NON-CIRCUMVENTION CLAUSE, THEY WOULD LOSE THIS OPPORTUNITY. FURTHERMORE, A NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT WOULD BE A Surer WAY OF PREVENTING CIRCUMVENTION OF THE AGREEMENT THROUGH INCREASES IN AIR FORCE MANPOWER, SINCE A NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT WOULD DEAL PRECISELY WITH AIR FORCE MANPOWER, WHILE A GENERAL NON-CIRCUMVENTION COMMITMENT WOULD BE LESS PRECISE, CHEATING THE POSSIBILITY OF MISUNDERSTANDING. IN ADDITION, SEEKING TO HANDLE AIR FORCE MANPOWER IN A NON-CIRCUMVENTION CLAUSE COULD LEAD THE OTHER SIDE TO SEEK LIMITS ON OTHER FORCES OR ON ARMAENTS. U.S. REP STRESSED THAT  
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 05690 02 OF 02 152144Z

INCLUSION OF AIR FORCE MANPOWER IN NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT CONTAINED IN GUIDANCE ON PHASE LINKAGE WOULD IN NO WAY CONSTITUTE AN INDICATION OF ALLIED WILLINGNESS TO REDUCE AIR FORCE MANPOWER IN PHASE II. THAT WAS A SEPARATE QUESTION AND NAC GUIDANCE TO THE AHG COULD MAKE THIS CLEAR.

8. U.S. REP, IN RESPONSE TO NETHERLANDS REP'S REMARKS, SAID U.S. DID NOT INTEND TO SEEK AMENDMENT OF RECENT NAC GUIDANCE TO AHG ON USE OF AIR MANPOWER DATA. LATTER GUIDANCE CONCERNED USE OF SUCH DATA FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE, AND SPECIFICALLY STATED THAT THE ROLE OF AIR FORCE MANPOWER IN THE NEGOTIATION (AND OF THE DATA USED IN THAT PARTICULAR CONTEXT), WAS A SEPARATE QUESTION. HE SAAID THE U.S. SHARED DUTCH CONCERN THAT INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER IN MANPOWER COMMON CEILING NOT DIVERT THE FOCUS OF THE NEGOTIATIONS FROM REDUCTIONS OF GROUND FORCES. IN FACT, THE U.S. PURPOSE IS TO ASSURE THAT THE FOCUS IS ON GROUND FORCE REDUCTIONS. UK REP (BAILES) SAID GER AUTHORITIES WANTED THE MBFR WORKING GROUP TO STUDY THE MILITARY-TECHNICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE U.S. PROPOSALS, EXCEPT FOR THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT. UK NOW AGREED WITH U.S. THAT NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT DOES NOT REQUIRE FURTHER STUDY IN WG. HOWEVER, UK DOES WANT BRIEF COMMENT FROM SACEUR ON HIS OPINION ON U.S. PROPOSAL. UK WOULD LIKE MC REP TO OBTAIN ANSWERS FROM SACEUR TO THE FOLLOWING THREE QUESTIONS BEFORE THE UK TAKES ITS FINAL DECISION ON THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT: 1) WOULD THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT MEAN THE ABANDONMENT OF ANY PLANNED INCREASES OR IMPROVEMENTS IN ALLIED AIR FORCES?; 2) WHAT EXCEPTIONS ARE NEEDED FOR ROUTINE TRAINING AND EXERCISES?; AND 3) ARE THERE CIRCUMSTANCES IN WHICH THE ALLIES MIGHT WISH TO INCREASE THEIR AIR FORCES IN CENTRAL EUROPE WITHOUT JEOPARDIZING AN MBFR AGREEMENT? BAILES SAID UK HAD CONSIDERED NON-CIRCUMVEVAV, :-7 3 - -, -)534,ATIVEOACINCLUSION OF AIR FORCE MANPOWER IN NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT. UK IS WILLING TO DISUCSS NON-CIRCUMVENTION, BUT IS LEANING TOWARD A NON-INCREASE APPROACH. SHE SAID HE AUTHORITIES ARE PARTICULARLY CONCERNED WITH THE DIFFICULTIES

OF VERIFICATION ON THE SOVIET SIDE IF THE ALLIES SOUGHT TO  
HANDLE AIR FORCE MANPOWER IN A NON-CIRCUMVENTION CLAUSE.

9. NETHERLANDS REP SAID HE HAD NO PROBLEM WITH GETTING SACEUR'S  
COMMENT FOR SPC ON NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT, BUT SPC NEEDED THIS  
COMMENT SOON. FRG REP SAID HE THOUGHT IT WOULD BE USEFUL FOR  
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 05690 02 OF 02 152144Z

SPC TO GET SACEUR'S OPINION. MC REP (GROUP CAPTAIN SMITH) NOTED  
THAT SACEUR'S ANSWERS TO THE FIRST TWO QUESTIONS  
WOULD BE GENERAL, AND IN FACT RESTED MAINLY WITH THE NATIONS  
CONCERNED. HE OBSERVED THAT ALL ALLIES WITH AIR FORCES IN THE  
NGA HAD NOW ANSWERED THE FIRST UK QUESTION EXCEPT CANADA. THE  
ANSWER TO THE SECOND UK QUESTION RESTED WITH THE U., THE UK AND  
CANADA. HE FURTHER OBSERVED THAT THE NAC APPROVED THE GUIDANCE  
ON NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT FOR GROUND FORCES WITH A CAVEAT  
THAT THE COMMITMENT SHOULD CONTAIN EXCEPTIONS TO ALLOW FOR  
NORMAL EXERCISES AND ROTATIONS, BUT THE NAC DID NOT FEEL IT  
NECESSARY TO DECIDE AT THAT TIME WHAT THOSE EXCEPTIONS SHOULD BE.

10. BELGIAN REP (BURNY) SAID THERE SEEMED TO BE A CONSENSUS  
THAT THE WG SHOULD EXAMINE THE MILITARY-TECHNICAL IMPLICATIONS  
OF THE U.S. PROPOSALS EXCEPT FOR THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT,  
WHERE SPC WAS UNDECIDED. U.S. REP POINTED OUT THAT THERE WAS  
NOTHING MORE THAT THE WG COULD DO ON THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT,  
AND THAT THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT AND THE FRG SUGGESTED  
ALTERNATIVE (NON-CIRCUMVENTION) WERE PROPER SUBJECTS FOR SPC  
DISCUSSION. U.S. BELIEVED NATO SHOULD LOOK AT MILITARY-TECHNICAL  
IMPLICATIONS OF THE OTHER U.S. PROPOSALS, AND TO THIS END THE  
U.S. WOULD INTRODUCE SHORTLY A PAPER ON ILLUSTRATIVE OPTIONS.  
HE ASKED THAT THE WG NOT UNDERTAKE ITS STUDY PRIOR TO INTRO-  
DUCTION OF THIS U.S. PAPER. RANTZAU SAID HE WAS WILLING TO  
HAVE ANOTHER ROUND OF DISCUSSIONS IN SPC ON NON-INCREASE/NON-  
CIRCUMVENTION, AND THEN TO ASK THE WG TO EXAMINE ANY QUESTIONS  
OF A MILITARY-TECHNICAL CHARACTER WHICH MAY HAVE ARISEN. GROUP  
CAPTAIN SMITH OBSERVED THAT A NON-CIRCUMVENTION AGREEMENT WOULD  
BE GENERAL IN NATURE. HE THOUGHT IT WOULD BE DIFFICULT TO

SPECIFY MANPOWER. A NON-CIRCUMVENTION AGREEMENT APPLIED TO  
AIR MANPOWER ALONE WOULD BE DIFFICULT TO ENVISAGE AND  
TO VERIFY.

11. SPC AGREED TO CONTINUE DISCUSSION OF NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT  
IN SPC, AT LEAST FOR TIME BEING, WHILE AWAITING SACEUR COMMENT,  
AND THAT WG SHOULD UNDERTAKE MILITARY-TECHNICAL ANALYSIS OF THE  
OTHER U.S. PROPOSALS. SPC WILL RETURN TO AIR MANPOWER ON FRIDAY,  
OCTOBER 18.

12. COMMENT: MISSION WILL, OF COURSE, CONTINUE TO STRESS THE  
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 05690 02 OF 02 152144Z

ADVANTAGES OF NON-INCREASE APPROACH OVER NON-CIRCUMVENTION. MISSION BELIEVES THAT IN ORDER TO FOCUS ALLIED THINKING ON THE NON-INCREASE APPROACH, THE TIME HAS COME FOR U.S. TO PROPOSE SPECIFIC LANGUAGE FOR THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT. IT MAY HELP MEET FRG CONCERNS IF THE FORMULATION WERE SEPARATE FROM THE GUIDANCE ON PHASE LINKAGE, AND NOT AN AMENDMENT. FOR EXAMPLE, SOMETHING LIKE THE LANGUAGE SUGGESTED IN PARA 3, REF A, SUPPLEMENTED BY THE LANGUAGE IN PARA 2, REF B, COULD STAND AS SEPARATE GUIDANCE, RATHER THAN AN AMENDMENT TO THE GUIDANCE ON LINKAGE, AND CONTAINS CONDITIONS OF INTEREST TO THE FRG. MISSION WOULD SUGGEST ADDING THE FOLLOWING SENTENCE TO SUCH LANGUAGE: "THE AHG SHOULD MAKE CLEAR TO THE WP THAT THIS SUGGESTION IN NO WAY IMPLIES CEILINGS OR REDUCTIONS ON AIR FORCE MANPOWER IN PHASE II." THIS SENTENCE SHOULD NOT ONLY MAKE THE TEXT MORE ACCEPTABLE TO FRG, BUT SHOULD ALSO PROVE USEFUL IN AHG PROBE OF PACT INTEREST IN INCLUSION OF AIR FORCE MANPOWER.

13. MISSION WOULD ALSO APPRECIATE WASHINGTON COMMENT ON SECOND UK QUESTION ON EXCEPTIONS FOR TRAINING AND EXERCISES. WE BELIEVE BEST LINE TO TAKE IS THAT EXCEPTIONS ARE NECESSARY, AS PROVIDED FOR IN LANGUAGE SUGGESTED IN PREVIOUS PARAGRAPH, BUT ALLIES CAN DECIDE LATER WHICH EXCEPTIONS THEY WANT, AS THEY DECIDED TO DO IN THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT ON GROUND FORCES.

14. FINALLY, MISSION BELIEVES THE SUBMISSION MENTIONED IN PARA 8, REF C WOULD BE MOST USEFUL IF RECEIVED BY THE END OF THIS WEEK. END COMMENT

15. ACTION REQUESTED: THE GUIDANCE REQUESTED IN THE PRECEDING THREE PARAGRAPHS IF POSSIBLE BY THE SPC MEETING ON FRIDAY, OCTOBER 18. RUMSFELD

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 11 JUN 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 15 OCT 1974  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** golinofr  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1974ATO05690  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1974/newtext/t19741091/abbryxuz.tel  
**Line Count:** 304  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 6  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** A) MBFR VIENNA 291; B) MBFR VIENNA 318; C) STATE 223226  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** golinofr  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 26 MAR 2002  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <26 MAR 2002 by elyme>; APPROVED <22 MAY 2002 by golinofr>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: SPC DISCUSSION OCTOBER 14 ON AIR MANPOWER  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA  
BONN  
LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR  
**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005